



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--------------------------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/798,916 | 03/11/2004 | Scott J. Broussard | AUS920030818US1 | 7011 |
| 45502 | 7590 | 12/07/2007 | EXAMINER | |
| DILLON & YUDELL LLP | | | BROPHY, MATTHEW J | |
| 8911 N. CAPITAL OF TEXAS HWY., | | | | |
| SUITE 2110 | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| AUSTIN, TX 78759 | | | 2191 | |
| | | | MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
| | | | 12/07/2007 | PAPER |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

| | | |
|--------------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------|
| Interview Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) |
| | 10/798,916 | BROUSSARD, SCOTT J. |
| | Examiner Matthew J. Brophy | Art Unit 2191 |

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Matthew J. Brophy. (3) Carlos Amorin.

(2) Qamhar Nahar. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 28 November 2007.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1, 11 and 21.

Identification of prior art discussed: US PG Pub 2004/0078540 Cirne et al.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant discussed 101 rejections to claims 11 and 21. Examiner gave suggestions as to how the 101 rejection to claim 21 might be resolved(using the terminology "storage device" in the claim), which applicant agreed to consider. Applicant explained the differences between the prior art and the invention, (monitoring the object's age). Examiner explained his interpretation of the claim as currently presented..

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

M.J.B.
WEI 2191
SPE 2191

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required